

REMARKS

Claims 11-20 are pending. Claims 11, 12-15 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perbet et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,915,231) in view of Adams (GB 2 265 885). Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perbet et al. in view of Adams and in further view of Saindon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,518,559).

103 Rejections

Claims 11, 12-15 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perbet et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,915,231) in view of Adams (GB 2 265 885). The Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that Perbet et al. in view of Adams does not anticipate or render obvious the present invention as is recited in Claims 11, 12-15 and 18-20.

The examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 11 which recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to an electronic system:

...providing backing member upon which a product is adhesively attached thereto; b) providing an adhering material for adhering said product to said backing material; c) applying said adhering material to said backing material for adhering disposing said product thereon...

Claims 12-15 and 18-20 depend from independent Claim 11 and recite further features of the present invention.

Perbet et al. does not anticipate or render obvious a product packaging method that includes “providing an adhering material for adhering said product to said backing material.” Perbet et al. only shows a system and process for packaging products under a transparent film. Perbet teaches that the product that is packaged is attached under the action of heat to a cardboard plate (equated in the Office Action to the recited “backing material.”) By contrast, Applicant’s Claim 11 sets forth a methodology that employs the use of an adhering material to attach a product to “backing material” that is a part of a package. It should be appreciated that while Perbet et al. is concerned with attaching a product under the action of heat, the Applicant’s claims are drawn to a methodology that employs the conceptually distinct and materially incompatible process of using an adhering material to attach a product. In fact, nowhere in the Perbet et al. reference is it taught or suggested that an adhering material be used to attach a product to a package component. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Perbet et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the Applicant’s invention as is set forth in Applicant’s Claims 11.

Adams does not overcome the deficiencies of Perbet et al. noted above. More specifically, Adams does not anticipate or render obvious a product packaging methodology that includes “providing an adhering material for adhering said product to said backing material.” Adams only shows a system and process for packaging products. The Examiner alleges that Adams teaches that “it is old and well known” in the packaging art to use an adhesive layer to attach objects.

By contrast, it should be appreciated that Perbet et al. teaches that a product that is packaged in accordance with his disclosed invention is attached under the action of heat to a

cardboard plate (equated in the Office Action to the recited “backing material).” The Applicant respectfully submits that to disturb the product packaging system of Perbet et al. by replacing its disclosed process of attaching a product under the action of heat with the conceptually distinct and materially incompatible process of using an adhesive material to attach the product as is alleged taught by Adams would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Perbet et al. in view of Adams does not anticipate or render obvious the Applicant’s invention as is set forth in Applicant’s Claims 11.

Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that Perbet et al. in view of Adams does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in independent Claim 11 and as such, Claim 11 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that Perbet et al. in view of Adams does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 12-15 and 18-20 dependent on Claim 11 and that Claims 12-15 and 18-20 overcome the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being dependent on an allowable base claims.

Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perbet et al. in view of Adams as applied to claim 11 in further view of Saindon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,518,559). Saindon et al. does not overcome the deficiencies of Perbet et al. and Adams noted above. More specifically, Saindon et al. does not anticipate or render obvious a product packaging methodology that includes “providing an adhering material for adhering said product to said backing material.” Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that Perbet et al. in view of Adams in further view of Saindon et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the present invention as is recited in Claims 16 and 17.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 8/21, 2004


John P. Wagner, Jr.
Registration No. 35,398
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060